



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/678,370	10/03/2003	Robert W. Jones JR.	2003P00276 US01	4026
7590 Alexander J. Burke Intellectual Property Department 5th Floor 170 Wood Avenue South Iselin, NJ 08830			EXAMINER ALI, MOHAMMAD	
			ART UNIT 2166	PAPER NUMBER
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS			12/29/2006	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/678,370

Applicant(s)

JONES ET AL.

Examiner

Mohammad Ali

Art Unit

2166

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 October 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-25 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 1-10 and 12-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over by US Published Patent Application No. 2001/0028364, henceforth referred to as "Fredell et al.". in view of Hendricks et al. ('Hendricks' hereinafter), USPGPUB 2002/0112249.

Claim 1 is anticipated by Fredell et al. as follows: **A system enabling a user of an application object, comprising an executable portion of an executable application, to access documents external to said application, comprising: a map associating a set of access links with (a) an application object identifier (§ 0040); and (b) an organization identifier identifying an organization, said set of access links supporting access to documents external to said application (§ 0040, wherein the person posting the documents indicates which groups should receive access); a link processor for initiating provision of data, the data representing a set of access links, to a user in response to a received organization identifier and a received application object identifier (§ 0061-0064); and a command processor for initiating access to an external document using a link in said set of access links in response to user command (§ 0043).**

Fredell et al. does not explicitly indicate the claimed a command processor for initiating access to an external document.

Hendricks teaches claimed a command processor for initiating access to an external document (Internet Explorer 4.0 web browser in Windows 98 operating system can be invoked as a command with the associated URL as an argument in the command line. When the said Internet Explorer is already active, an external process can request the web browser to access a URL by simulating a user input of the query URL to the URL specification textbox of the web browser followed by the key code of the Enter key, see para. 0044, Hendricks).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the present invention to combine the teachings of the cited references because a command processor for initiating access to an external document of Hendricks teaching would have allowed Fredell et al. system to effectively optimizes the user's interaction in retrieving desired information on the world-wide-web associated with a keyword displayed in a document viewer from several tedious manual actions into simple two actions: highlighting desired keyword and applying a hot key as suggested by Hendricks at para. 0014.

Claim 2 is anticipated by Fredell et al. as in claim 1, **wherein said map associates said set of access links with a role identifier, the role identifier identifying a particular user performable role (§ 0040); and said link processor initiates provision of data representing said set of access links to a user in response to a received role identifier (§ 0042).**

Claim 3 is anticipated by Fredell et al. as in claim 1, **wherein said map associates a plurality of sets of access links with (a) a plurality of application object identifiers, the object identifiers identifying a corresponding plurality of application objects (§ 0043), and (b) a plurality of organization identifiers, the organization identifiers identifying a corresponding plurality of organizations; and said link processor selects a set of access links from said plurality of sets of access links in response to a received organization identifier and a received application object identifier, the link processor initiating provision of data representing said selected set of access links to a user (§ 0010).**

Claim 4 is anticipated by Fredell et al. as in claim 3, wherein said map associates said plurality of sets of access links with a plurality of role identifiers identifying a corresponding plurality of roles performed by a user (§ 0011); and said link processor selects a set of access links from said plurality of sets of access links in response to a received role identifier, the link processor initiating provision of data representing said selected set of access links to a user (§ 0041).

Claim 5 is anticipated by Fredell et al. as in claim 1, wherein said map comprises at least one of (a) a plurality of maps, (b) a data repository, (c) a database, (d) a plurality of databases, and (e) a plurality of data repositories (§ 0009).

Claim 6 is anticipated by Fredell et al. as in claim 1, wherein an access link comprises at least one of (i) a universal resource locator, (ii) an internet protocol address, (iii) a storage file directory address, (iv) a storage file address, (v) a communication port address, (vi) a server address and (vii) an address for use in locating a document (§ 0040; figure 4, § 0062-0063); and a document comprises at least one of (a) a web page, (b) an HTML file, (c) a Word document, (d) an SGML document, (e) an XML document, (f) a multimedia file, (g) an Excel file, (h) a Portable Document Format file, (i) an executable file, (1) a text file and (k) an accessible file (§ 0043).

Claim 7 is anticipated by Fredell et al. as in claim 1, wherein said link processor initiates provision of data representing a menu window for displaying said set of access links to a user (figure 4).

Claim 8 is anticipated by Fredell et al. as in claim 7, **wherein said link processor determines an order of display of said access links in said menu window based on at least one of (a) a determined relative importance of individual access links of said set of access links to a role performable by a user, (b) a determined relative importance of access links in said set of access links, (c) alphabetical order, (d) a determined relative importance of access links of said set of access links to an organization and (e) another determined logical order (¶ 0010, the relative importance of the deadline is the order).**

Claim 9 is anticipated by Fredell et al. as in claim 1, **wherein said command processor initiates access to said external document using a link in said set of access links, the access to the external document being initiated from within said executable application object (¶ 0010).**

Claim 10 is anticipated by Fredell et al. as in claim 9, **wherein said command processor initiates access to said external document using a link in said set of access links concurrently with operation of said executable application object (¶ 0010).**

Claim 12 is anticipated by Fredell et al. as in claim 1, **wherein an access link supports access to a second and different executable application (¶ 0010); and said command processor initiates access to said second application (¶ 0010).**

Claim 13 is anticipated by Fredell et al. as in claim 1, **wherein said organization identifier comprises a location identifier (¶ 0009).**

Claim 14 is anticipated by Fredell et al. as follows: **A system enabling a user of an application object, comprising an executable portion of an executable application, to access documents external to said application, comprising: a map associating a set of access links with (a) an application object identifier (§ 0040) and (b) a role identifier identifying a particular user performable role (§ 0040), said set of access links supporting access to external documents (§ 0040); a link processor for initiating providing data representing a set of access links to a user in response to a received role identifier and a received application object identifier (§ 0061-0064); and a command processor for initiating access to an external document using a link in said set of access links in response to user command (§ 0043).**

Fredell et al. does not explicitly indicate the claimed a command processor for initiating access to an external document.

Hendricks teaches claimed a command processor for initiating access to an external document (Internet Explorer 4.0 web browser in Windows 98 operating system can be invoked as a command with the associated URL as an argument in the command line. When the said Internet Explorer is already active, an external process can request the web browser to access a URL by simulating a user input of the query URL to the URL specification textbox of the web browser followed by the key code of the Enter key, see para. 0044, Hendricks).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the present invention to combine the teachings of the cited references because

Art Unit: 2166

a command processor for initiating access to an external document of Hendricks teaching would have allowed Fredell et al. system to effectively optimizes the user's interaction in retrieving desired information on the world-wide-web associated with a keyword displayed in a document viewer from several tedious manual actions into simple two actions: highlighting desired keyword and applying a hot key as suggested by Hendricks at para. 0014.

Claim 15 is anticipated by Fredell et al. as follows: **A system enabling a user of an application object, comprising an executable portion of an executable application, to access documents external to said application, comprising: an authorization processor for determining whether a user is authorized to access a particular application object of a plurality of objects within an application in response to a received user identification information and a received application object identifier (figure 2, element 56); a map associating a plurality of sets of access links with a plurality of application object identifiers identifying a corresponding plurality of application objects, said access links supporting access to external documents (§ 0040 & 0043; figure 4, § 0062-0063); and a link processor for employing, in response to successful user authorization, said map in selecting a set of access links from said plurality of sets in response to said received application object identifier and for initiating providing data representing said selected set of access links to a user (§ 0011 & 0043).**

Fredell et al. does not explicitly indicate the claimed a command processor for initiating access to an external document.

Hendricks teaches claimed a command processor for initiating access to an external document (Internet Explorer 4.0 web browser in Windows 98 operating system can be invoked as a command with the associated URL as an argument in the command line. When the said Internet Explorer is already active, an external process can request the web browser to access a URL by simulating a user input of the query URL to the URL specification textbox of the web browser followed by the key code of the Enter key, see para. 0044, Hendricks).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the present invention to combine the teachings of the cited references because a command processor for initiating access to an external document of Hendricks teaching would have allowed Fredell et al. system to effectively optimizes the user's interaction in retrieving desired information on the world-wide-web associated with a keyword displayed in a document viewer from several tedious manual actions into simple two actions: highlighting desired keyword and applying a hot key as suggested by Hendricks at para. 0014.

Claim 16 is anticipated by Fredell et al. as in claim 15, **wherein said map associates said plurality of sets of access links with at least one of (a) a role identifier identifying a user performable role and (b) an organization identifier identifying an organization** (§ 0040).

Claim 17 is anticipated by Fredell et al. as in claim 16, **wherein said link processor selects said set of access links from said plurality of sets in response**

to at least one of (a) a received role identifier identifying a user performable role and (b) a received organization identifier identifying an organization (§ 0042).

Claim 18 is anticipated by Fredell et al. as in claim 15, including a command processor for initiating access to an external document using a link in said set of selected access links, the command processor initiating access from within an executable application object (§ 0010).

Claim 19 is anticipated by Fredell et al. as in claim 15, wherein said plurality of sets of access links include prioritized sets of access links (§ 0010); and said link processor selects a single set of access links from said plurality of sets based on set priority (§ 0092).

Claim 20 is anticipated by Fredell et al. as in claim 15, wherein said authorization processor determines whether a user is authorized to access an external document in response to received user identification documentation (§ 0054-0056), the system further comprising a command processor for inhibiting access to an external document using a link in said set of selected access links in response to a denial of user authorization (§ 0063-0064).

Claim 21 is anticipated by Fredell et al. as in claim 15, wherein said authorization processor determines whether a user is authorized to access an external document using a link in said selected set of access links in response to received user identification information (§ 0064); and said link processor inhibits providing data representing an access link to a user in response to a denial of user authorization to access said external document generated by said

Art Unit: 2166

authorization processor (§ 0064, if only authorized users are permitted unauthorized users must be inhibited).

Claim 22 is anticipated by Fredell et al. as in claim 15, **wherein said authorization processor maintains an audit trail identifying access to external documents by storing records identifying at least one of (a) a document accessed, (b) a time and date of access, (c) an entity accessing a document and (d) a source of an access request** (§ 0041, figure 2 usage module 52).

Claim 23 is anticipated by Fredell et al. as follows: **A method for enabling a user of an application object, comprising an executable portion of an executable application, to access documents external to said application, comprising the steps of: associating a set of access links with (a) an application object identifier (§ 0040) and (b) an organization identifier identifying an organization, said set of access links supporting access to external documents (§ 0040); initiating providing data representing a set of access links to a user in response to a received organization identifier and a received application object identifier (§ 0061-0064); and initiating access to an external document using a link in said set of access links in response to a user command** (§ 0043).

Fredell et al. does not explicitly indicate the claimed a command processor for initiating access to an external document.

Hendricks teaches claimed a command processor for initiating access to an external document (Internet Explorer 4.0 web browser in Windows 98 operating system can be invoked as a command with the associated URL as an argument in the

command line. When the said Internet Explorer is already active, an external process can request the web browser to access a URL by simulating a user input of the query URL to the URL specification textbox of the web browser followed by the key code of the Enter key, see para. 0044, Hendricks).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the present invention to combine the teachings of the cited references because a command processor for initiating access to an external document of Hendricks teaching would have allowed Fredell et al. system to effectively optimizes the user's interaction in retrieving desired information on the world-wide-web associated with a keyword displayed in a document viewer from several tedious manual actions into simple two actions: highlighting desired keyword and applying a hot key as suggested by Hendricks at para. 0014.

Claim 24 is anticipated by Fredell et al. as follows: **A method for enabling a user of an application object, comprising an executable portion of an executable application, to access documents external to said application, comprising the steps of: associating a set of access links with (a) an application object identifier (§ 0040) and (b) a role identifier identifying a particular user performable role, said set of access links supporting access to external documents (§ 0040); initiating providing data representing a set of access links to a user in response to a received role identifier and a received application object identifier (§ 0061-0064); and initiating access to an external document using a link in said set of access links in response to a user command (§ 0043).**

Fredell et al. does not explicitly indicate the claimed a command processor for initiating access to an external document.

Hendricks teaches claimed a command processor for initiating access to an external document (Internet Explorer 4.0 web browser in Windows 98 operating system can be invoked as a command with the associated URL as an argument in the command line. When the said Internet Explorer is already active, an external process can request the web browser to access a URL by simulating a user input of the query URL to the URL specification textbox of the web browser followed by the key code of the Enter key, see para. 0044, Hendricks).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the present invention to combine the teachings of the cited references because a command processor for initiating access to an external document of Hendricks teaching would have allowed Fredell et al. system to effectively optimizes the user's interaction in retrieving desired information on the world-wide-web associated with a keyword displayed in a document viewer from several tedious manual actions into simple two actions: highlighting desired keyword and applying a hot key as suggested by Hendricks at para. 0014.

Claim 25 is anticipated by Fredell et al. as follows: **A method of enabling a user of an application object, comprising an executable portion of an executable application, to access documents external to said application, comprising the steps of: determining whether the user is authorized to access a particular application object of a plurality of objects within an application in response to**

received user identification information and a received application object identifier (§ 0064); associating a plurality of sets of access links with a plurality of application object identifiers identifying a corresponding plurality of application objects, said access links supporting access to external documents (§ 0064 & § 0066-0067); and in response to user authorization, selecting a set of access links from said plurality of sets of access links in response to said received application object identifier and initiating providing data representing said selected set of access links to the user (§ 0041).

Fredell et al. does not explicitly indicate the claimed a command processor for initiating access to an external document.

Hendricks teaches claimed a command processor for initiating access to an external document (Internet Explorer 4.0 web browser in Windows 98 operating system can be invoked as a command with the associated URL as an argument in the command line. When the said Internet Explorer is already active, an external process can request the web browser to access a URL by simulating a user input of the query URL to the URL specification textbox of the web browser followed by the key code of the Enter key, see para. 0044, Hendricks).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the present invention to combine the teachings of the cited references because a command processor for initiating access to an external document of Hendricks teaching would have allowed Fredell et al. system to effectively optimizes the user's interaction in retrieving desired information on the world-wide-web associated with a

Art Unit: 2166

keyword displayed in a document viewer from several tedious manual actions into simple two actions: highlighting desired keyword and applying a hot key as suggested by Hendricks at para. 0014.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Fredell et al. and Hendricks et al and further in view of US Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0049610, henceforth referred to as "Hazumi".

Claim 11 is taught by Fredell et al and Hendricks as in claim 1. However, Fredell et al. and Hendricks does not explicitly indicate **said application comprises a laboratory information system and said external document comprises information concerning at least one of (a) test procedures, (b) chemistry procedures, (c) microbiology procedures, (d) hematology procedures (e) phlebotomy procedures,**

Art Unit: 2166

(f) instrument support, (g) an electronic patient medical record, (h) orders to perform patient procedures, (i) laboratory test results and (j) a patient visit. Yet, Hazumi teaches said application comprises a laboratory information system and said external document comprises information concerning at least one of (a) test procedures, (b) chemistry procedures, (c) microbiology procedures, (d) hematology procedures (e) phlebotomy procedures, (f) instrument support, (g) an electronic patient medical record, (h) orders to perform patient procedures, (i) laboratory test results and (j) a patient visit (Hazumi: ¶ 0006).

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would have recognized the importance of enabling "a medical practitioner and a small hospital, which have some difficulty to introduce and operate a large electronic medical record information management system, can use an electronic medical record in high security." Without enabling both large corporate and smaller privately owned medical entities access to the information retrieval network there is little point in attempting to establish a comprehensive electronic patient medical record system. Thus, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have applied the teachings of Fredell et al. and Hendricks to the medical record domain as taught by Hazumi.

Conclusion

The prior art made record of on form PTO-892 and not relied upon is considered pertinent to the applicants' disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mohammad Ali whose telephone number is 571-272-4105. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 10:00-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on (571) 272-3978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


Mohammad Ali
Primary Examiner

MA
December 23, 2006